



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1460
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/733,947

12/11/2003

William Kress Bodin

AUS920030836US1

8912

34533

7590

12/14/2006

INTERNATIONAL CORP (BLF)
c/o BIGGERS & OHANIAN, LLP
P.O. BOX 1469
AUSTIN, TX 78767-1469

EXAMINER

BOTTS, MICHAEL K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/733,947

Applicant(s)

BODIN ET AL.

Examiner

Michael K. Botts

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on September 27, 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is a Final Office Action on the merits. This action is responsive to the following communication: "Response to Office Action Dated June 27, 2006," which was filed on September 27, 2006.
2. Claims 1-33 are currently pending in the case, with claims 1, 12, and 23 being the independent claims.
3. The double patenting rejection is maintained.
4. Claims 1-33 are rejected.

The Specification

5. Applicant is reminded of the continuing requirement to update the status (pending, allowed, etc.) of all parent priority applications in the first line of the specification, when appropriate, and the status of all citations of U.S. filed applications in the specification should also be updated, when appropriate.

Double Patenting Rejection

6. A double patenting rejection was made in the Second Non-Final Office Action, which was filed June 27, 2006. Applicants responded in a Response to Office Action Dated June 27, 2006, and stated that a Terminal Disclaimer had been filed with that Response.

The Examiner notes that no Terminal Disclaimer for this application is found in the files. Because Applicants have not remedied the double patenting rejection, it is herein maintained.

Claims Rejection – 35 U.S.C. 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-4, 7-9, 12-15, 18-20, 23-26, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raman (U.S. Patent 5,748,186), issued May 5, 1998 [hereinafter "Raman"], in view of Damiani, et al. "A Fine-Grained Access Control System for XML Documents," ACM Transactions on Information and System Security, Vol. 5, No. 2, May 2002, Pages 169-202, [hereinafter "Damiani"].

Regarding **independent claim 1**, Raman in view of Damiani teaches:

A method for creating a presentation document, the method comprising:

creating, in dependence upon an original document, a structured

document comprising one or more structural elements;

(See, Raman, col. 2, lines 18-35. See also, Raman, col. 3, lines 6-11, teaching a computer implemented system of interactively presenting electronically encoded multi-

media information in a plurality of presentation modalities, including retrieving a document and converting the information to a "common intermediate representation" with a structure of the information.)

classifying a structural element of the structured document according to a presentation attribute; and

(As disclosed in the application, classifying a structural element reads on parsing a structured documents into a hierarchical tree based on markup language tags as nodes of the tree structure. See, Raman, col. 2, lines 27-28, teaching that the converted document is stored in the memory of a computer in the form of a hierarchical attribute tree. See, Raman, col. 3, lines 41-44, teaching recognizing file type by extension, i.e.: "html." See also, Raman, col. 5, lines 47 through col. 6, line 4, teaching identification of the document by tags, such as <html>. And see, Raman, col. 4, lines 38-49, teaching receiving a source document by characters encoded as text as well as marks placed in the text to define the structure, and the "recognizer" to parse the character stream into fundamental source elements, for example, title, sections, sub-sections, paragraphs, sentences, links, forms and so forth. See also, Raman, col. 5, lines 47 through col. 6, line 4, teaching identification of the document by text element tags, such as <head>, <title>, <body> and <p>.)

creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes an identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document.

Art Unit: 2176

(See, Raman, col. 2, lines 36-45, teaching the use of "control signals" as "presentation grammar" to control the modality being used to control the presentation. See, Raman, col. 6, lines 30-33, teaching that a control signal may include recognized speech as an input. See, also Raman, col. 3, lines 30-34, teaching that the data retriever and the presenter of the system may be controlled by voice recognized input couple to a speech recognizer. And see, Raman, col. 5, lines 38-46, teaching "navigational methods associated with objects allow the user to browse through the text by taking into consideration the underlying structure of the document." And see, Raman, claim 1, lines 13-15, teaching "presenting the common intermediate representation using a plurality of user communication modalities according to the hierarchical attribute trees." And see, Raman, col. 4, lines 22-27, teaching speech response to aural presentation of stock data. For each type of speech response, it is inherent that there be an associated grammar element.

Raman teaches the invention as stated above, but does not expressly teach the "classifying a structural element of the structured document according to a presentation attribute." It is noted that "classifying a structural element of the structured document according to a presentation attribute" is read as inserting tags to identify sections of the document. The identification of sections of the document is at least inherent in creating a structured document from an original document "comprising one or more structural elements."

It is further noted that a "presentation attribute" is read as one of the names of groups of individual users, used to identify which users will be shown which data. For

Art Unit: 2176

example, the department name of "research" would allow employees in the research department to review material, however employees in "Sales" may not be permitted access. Examples of presentation attributes include "company names, department names, security levels, technical levels, and so on." See, disclosure, page 8, lines 11-16.

Damiani expressly teaches the tagging of a document elements with start and end tags of sections of a document which may be accessed by individual users within specified groups. See, Damiani, page 191, section 6.2, and see pages 183-185, section 5.1, teaching authorizations.

Raman and Damiani are combinable in that they both involve the art of identifying sections of a markup language document with identifications which enable the access to control the document. Raman teaches manipulation of the objects within that scheme, and Damiani teaches users who are permitted to access the document within that scheme.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Raman and Damiani for the obvious and beneficial purpose of limiting access to view certain portions of a document to certain users.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is expressed in Damiani for purposes of security, permitting access rights based on that groups need-to-know. The example given in Damiani is with medical records where hospital administrators, nurses, and doctors have different rights to sections of patient medical records based

on their need for the information, yet keeping the remainder of the records confidential.
See, Damiani, pages 192-196, example 6.1.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Raman and Damiani to result in the limitations specified in claim 1.

Regarding **dependent claim 2**, Raman in view of Damiani teaches:

The method of claim 1 wherein classifying a structural element comprises:
identifying a presentation attribute for the structural element;
identifying a classification identifier in dependence upon the presentation attribute; and
inserting the classification identifier in association with the structural element in the structured document.

(The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Raman, col. 4, lines 2-5, teaching that the user may select the presentation style, which inherently includes inserting classification identifiers, tags, in the structured document. See also, Damiani expressly teaches the tagging of a document elements with start and end tags of sections of a document which may be accessed by individual users within specified groups. See, Damiani, page 191, section 6.2, and see pages 183-185, section 5.1, teaching authorizations.)

Regarding **dependent claim 3**, Raman in view of Damiani teaches:

The method of claim 2 wherein:

identifying a presentation attribute for the structural element includes selecting a presentation attribute from a list of supported presentation attributes; identifying a classification identifier includes identifying a classification identifier associated with the presentation attribute on the list; and inserting the classification identifier includes manually editing the structured document.

(The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Raman, col. 4, lines 2-5, teaching that the user may select the presentation style, which inherently includes inserting classification identifiers, tags, in the structured document. See also, Damiani expressly teaches the tagging of a document elements with start and end tags of sections of a document which may be accessed by individual users within specified groups. See, Damiani, page 191, section 6.2, and see pages 183-185, section 5.1, teaching authorizations.)

Regarding **dependent claim 4**, Raman in view of Damiani teaches:

The method of claim 2 wherein:

identifying a presentation attribute for the structural element includes selecting a presentation attribute from a list of supported presentation attributes, the presentation attribute having an associated classification identifier;

identifying a classification identifier includes inserting the classification identifier in a data structure in association with a structural element identifier for the structural element; and

inserting the classification identifier in the structured document includes reading the classification identifier from the data structure in dependence upon the structural element identifier.

(The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Raman, col. 4, lines 2-5, teaching that the user may select the presentation style, which inherently includes inserting classification identifiers, tags, in the structured document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 7**, Raman in view of Damiani teaches:

The method of claim 1 wherein creating a structured document further comprises inserting in the structured document structural element identifiers for the structural elements.

(The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Raman, col. 4, lines 2-5, teaching that the user may select the presentation style, which inherently includes inserting classification identifiers, tags, in the structured document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 8**, Raman in view of Damiani teaches:

The method of claim 1 wherein creating a structured document further comprises converting existing structural element identifiers from the original

document to structural element identifiers for the structural elements of the structured document.

(The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Raman, col. 2, lines 18-34, and col. 3, line 6 through col. 4, line 76, teaching receiving original documents, e.g.: rendered in HTML, which is a structured document language, and parsing the data to a structured hierarchical attributed tree.)

Regarding **dependent claim 9**, Raman in view of Damiani teaches:

The method of claim 1 wherein creating a presentation grammar for the structured document comprises:

identifying the content type of the original document;

(The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Raman, col. 5, lines 47-56, teaching retrieval, recognition, and presentation of an HTML document, as an example of the invention. See also, Raman, col. 3, lines 6-8, teaching a "recognizer 130" coupled to the receiver 120, to convert information 11 into a common intermediate high-level logical data structure 200, the recognizer must inherently identify and know the content type of the original document in order to process it.)

selecting, in dependence upon the content type, a full presentation grammar from among a multiplicity of full presentation grammars; and

(See, Raman, col. 3, lines 8-20, teaching, for example, presentation of aural information by a speech synthesizer, monitor, Braille and by animated cartoon. See also, Raman,

col. 3, lines 30-34, teaching the use of a voice input speech recognizer to control the presenter of the content types.)

filtering the full presentation grammar into a presentation grammar for the structured document in dependence upon the structural elements of the structured document.

(It is noted that filtering the full presentation grammar includes writing from the full presentation grammar to the presentation grammar for the structured document each grammar element having a structural element identifier of a structural element that occurs in the structured document. Applicants' disclosure, page 3 lines 23-26.

See, Raman, col. 2, lines 36-45, teaching the use of "control signals" as "presentation grammar" to control the modality being used to control the presentation. See, Raman, col. 6, lines 30-33, teaching that a control signal may include recognized speech as an input. See, also Raman, col. 3, lines 30-34, teaching that the data retriever and the presenter of the system may be controlled by voice recognized input couple to a speech recognizer. And see, Raman, col. 5, lines 38-46, teaching "navigational methods associated with objects allow the user to browse through the text by taking into consideration the underlying structure of the document." And see, Raman, claim 1, lines 13-15, teaching "presenting the common intermediate representation using a plurality of user communication modalities according to the hierarchical attribute trees." And see, Raman, col. 4, lines 22-27, teaching speech response to aural presentation of stock data. For each type of speech response, it is inherent that there be an associated grammar.)

Regarding **claims 12-15**, claims 12-15, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1-4, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding **claims 18-20**, claims 18-20, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 7-9, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding **claims 23-26**, claims 23-26, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1-4, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding **claims 29-31**, claims 29-31, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 7-9, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

8. **Claims 5-6, 10-11, 16-17, 21-22, 27-28, and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raman (U.S. Patent 5,748,186), issued May 5, 1998 [hereinafter "Raman"], in view of Damiani, et al. "A Fine-Grained Access Control System for XML Documents," ACM Transactions on Information and System Security, Vol. 5, No. 2, May 2002, Pages 169-202, [hereinafter "Damiani"], and further in view of Josephson, (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0023435 A1), published January 30, 2003 [hereinafter "Josephson"].**

Regarding **dependent claim 5**, Raman in view of Damiani and further in view of Josephson teaches:

The method of claim 2 further comprising providing a list of supported presentation attributes including at least one keyword and at least one indication of structural insertion scope for each presentation attribute, wherein:

identifying a presentation attribute for the structural element includes selecting a presentation attribute from the list in dependence upon a keyword from the structured document;

identifying a classification identifier includes identifying a classification identifier associated with the presentation attribute on the list; and

inserting the classification identifier includes inserting the classification identifier in the structured document according to a structural insertion scope for the selected presentation attribute.

(The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated herein by this reference.

Raman in view of Damiani teach the creation of a structured document for user interaction based on attributes and classification, but they do not expressly teach a keyword and a scope.

Josephson expressly teaches the use of a keyword and scope within a "command structure, and lists within a "group." See, Josephson, paragraphs [0191]-[0259].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Raman, Damiani, and Josephson to result in a user interactive control of a structured document using a list of attributes, classifications (tags), and associated scope.

Raman and Damiani and Josephson are related to the art of user interactions with computers to control document production, with Raman and Josephson also including via voice recognition commands, and both use tag, or classification, structured documents.

The suggestion or motivation for combining the references is found in Josephson, discussing the invention as an improvement to "voice-mousing" and control of "select next" type commands, which is one type of navigational control discussed in Raman. See, Josephson, paragraphs [0008]-[0010], and see, Raman, col. 7, lines 5-50.)

Regarding **dependent claim 6**, Raman in view of Damiani and further in view of Josephson teaches:

The method of claim 2 further comprising providing a list of supported presentation attributes including at least one data pattern and at least one indication of structural insertion scope for each presentation attribute, wherein:

identifying a presentation attribute for the structural element includes selecting a presentation attribute from the list in dependence upon a data pattern from the structured document;

identifying a classification identifier includes identifying a classification identifier associated with the presentation attribute on the list; and
inserting the classification identifier includes inserting the classification identifier in the structured document according to a structural insertion scope for the selected presentation attribute.

(The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated herein by this reference.

Raman in view of Damiani teach the creation of a structured document for user interaction based on attributes and classification, but they do not expressly teach a keyword and a scope.

Josephson expressly teaches the use of a keyword and scope within a "command structure, and lists within a "group." See, Josephson, paragraphs [0191]-[0259].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Raman and Damiani and Josephson to result in a user interactive control of a structured document using a list of attributes, classifications (tags), and associated scope.

Raman and Damiani and Josephson are related to the art of user interactions with computers to control document production, With Raman and Josephson also including via voice recognition commands, and both use tag, or classification, structured documents.

The suggestion or motivation for combining the references is found in Josephson, discussing the invention as an improvement to "voice-mousing" and control

Art Unit: 2176

of "select next" type commands, which is one type of navigational control discussed in Raman. See, Josephson, paragraphs [0008]-[0010], and see, Raman, col. 7, lines 5-50.)

Regarding **dependent claim 10**, Raman in view of Damiani and further in view of Josephson teaches:

The method of claim 9 wherein the full grammar comprises a multiplicity of grammar elements for the content type, wherein each grammar element includes:

an identifier of a structural element;

a key phrase for invoking a presentation action; and

a presentation action identifier representing a presentation action.

(The rejection of claim 9 is incorporated herein by this reference.

Raman in view of Damiani teach the creation of a structured document for user interaction based on attributes and classification, but they do not expressly teach a key phrase.

Josephson expressly teaches the use of a key phrase for invoking a presentation action. See, Josephson, paragraphs [0191]-[0259].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Raman and Damiani and Josephson to result in a user interactive control of a structured document using a list of attributes, classifications (tags), and associated scope.

Raman and Damiani and Josephson are related to the art of user interactions with computers to control document production, with Raman and Josephson also including via voice recognition commands, and both use tag, or classification, structured documents.

The suggestion or motivation for combining the references is found in Josephson, discussing the invention as an improvement to "voice-mousing" and control of "select next" type commands, which is one type of navigational control discussed in Raman. See, Josephson, paragraphs [0008]-[0010], and see, Raman, col. 7, lines 5-50.)

Regarding **dependent claim 11**, Raman in view of Damiani and further in view of Josephson teaches:

The method of claim 9 wherein filtering the full presentation grammar comprises writing from the full presentation grammar to the presentation grammar for the structured document each grammar element having an identifier of a structural element that occurs in the structured document.

(The rejection of claim 9 is incorporated herein by this reference.

Raman and Damiani teach the creation of a structured document for user interaction based on attributes and classification, but they do not expressly teach writing from the full presentation grammar to the presentation grammar for the structured document.

Josephson expressly teaches "groups" as collections of identifications for invoking a presentation action. See, Josephson, paragraphs [0191]-[0259].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Raman and Damiani and Josephson to result in a user interactive control of a structured document using a list of attributes, classifications (tags), and associated scope.

Raman and Damiani and Josephson are related to the art of user interactions with computers to control document production. With Raman and Josephson also including via voice recognition commands, and both use tag, or classification, structured documents.

The suggestion or motivation for combining the references is found in Josephson, discussing the invention as an improvement to "voice-mousing" and control of "select next" type commands, which is one type of navigational control discussed in Raman. See, Josephson, paragraphs [0008]-[0010], and see, Raman, col. 7, lines 5-50.)

Regarding **claims 16-17**, claims 16-17, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 5 and 6, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding **claims 21-22**, claims 21-22, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 10-11, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding **claims 27-28**, claims 27-28, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 5 and 6, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding **claims 32-33**, claims 32-33, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 10-11, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

9. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed September 27, 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Regarding rejection of claim 1, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Applicants argue that the first reference, Damiani, "does not teach or suggest a presentation document that includes a presentation grammar and a structured document." Applicants further argue that the second reference, Raman, "also does not teach or suggest a presentation document that includes a presentation grammar and a structured document." See, Response, pages 6-7.

The Examiner disagrees.

Claim 1 specifies: "a structured document comprising one or more structural elements" created "in dependence upon an original document." Damiani is not cited for teaching the presentation document, rather, it is cited for teaching tagging the document. Raman teaches an "intermediate document" as the structured document, and further teaches "in the form of a hierarchical attribute tree" as the "one or more structural elements." Raman also teaches the original document as the originally received information that is converted to the "intermediate document." See, Raman, col. 2, lines 19-35.

Regarding rejection of claim 1:

Applicants argue that "Raman never even once mentions the term 'grammar.'" See, Response, page 7.

The Examiner disagrees.

The "grammar" of the present application is taught as "control signals" in Raman. See, Raman, col. 2, lines 36-45, teaching the use of "control signals" as "presentation grammar" to control the modality being used to control the presentation. See, Raman, col. 6, lines 30-33, teaching that a control signal may include recognized speech as an input. See, also Raman, col. 3, lines 30-34, teaching that the data retriever and the presenter of the system may be controlled by voice recognized input couple to a speech recognizer. And see, Raman, col. 5, lines 38-46, teaching "navigational methods associated with objects allow the user to browse through the text by taking into

Art Unit: 2176

consideration the underlying structure of the document.” And see, Raman, claim 1, lines 13-15, teaching “presenting the common intermediate representation using a plurality of user communication modalities according to the hierarchical attribute trees.” And see, Raman, col. 4, lines 22-27, teaching speech response to aural presentation of stock data. For each type of speech response, it is inherent that there be an associated grammar.

Regarding rejection of claim 1:

Applicants argue “Furthermore, even if Raman suggests a grammar, Raman at column 3, lines 30-35, suggests that such a grammar would be contained in the interactive interface – not the common intermediate representation.” See, Response, page 7.

The Examiner disagrees.

Claim 1 specifies “creating a presentation grammar ***for*** the structured document” not ***in*** the structured document, as argued by Applicants. Raman teaches a presentation grammar, “control signals,” for the structured document. See, Raman, col. 6, lines 30-33, teaching that a control signal may include recognized speech as an input.

Regarding rejection of claim 1:

FIRST: Applicants argue that the references, Raman in view of Damiani, fails to teach "grammar elements each of which includes an identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document." See, Response, pages 8-9.

The Examiner disagrees.

See, Raman, col. 2, lines 36-45, teaching the use of "control signals" as "presentation grammar" to control the modality being used to control the presentation. See, Raman, col. 6, lines 30-33, teaching that a control signal may include recognized speech as an input. See, also Raman, col. 3, lines 30-34, teaching that the data retriever and the presenter of the system may be controlled by voice recognized input couple to a speech recognizer. And see, Raman, col. 5, lines 38-46, teaching "navigational methods associated with objects allow the user to browse through the text by taking into consideration the underlying structure of the document." And see, Raman, claim 1, lines 13-15, teaching "presenting the common intermediate representation using a plurality of user communication modalities according to the hierarchical attribute trees." And see, Raman, col. 4, lines 22-27, teaching speech response to aural presentation of stock data. For each type of speech response, it is inherent that there be an associated grammar element.

SECOND: Applicants argue further: "In fact, Raman" "does not even mention 'grammar,' 'presentation grammar,' 'grammar elements,' 'grammar elements each of which includes an identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document.' or 'creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each

Art Unit: 2176

of which includes an identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document." See, Response, pages 9-14.

The Examiner disagrees that the limitations of claim 1 are not taught by the references.

As identified above, the limitations of the claims are taught by the references. The references do not use, nor are they required to use, the same terminology as the claims.

Regarding rejection of claims 1-4, 7-9, 12-15, 18-20, 23-26, and 29-31:

Applicants argue a lack of suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Raman and Damiani.

The Examiner disagrees.

Raman teaches the invention as stated above, but does not expressly teach the "classifying a structural element of the structured document according to a presentation attribute." It is noted that "classifying a structural element of the structured document according to a presentation attribute" is read as inserting tags to identify sections of the document. The identification of sections of the document is at least inherent in creating a structured document from an original document "comprising one or more structural elements."

It is further noted that a "presentation attribute" is read as one of the names of groups of individual users, used to identify which users will be shown which data. For example, the department name of "research" would allow employees in the research

Art Unit: 2176

department to review material, however employees in "Sales" may not be permitted access. Examples of presentation attributes include "company names, department names, security levels, technical levels, and so on." See, disclosure, page 8, lines 11-16.

Damiani expressly teaches the tagging of a document elements with start and end tags of sections of a document which may be accessed by individual users within specified groups. See, Damiani, page 191, section 6.2, and see pages 183-185, section 5.1, teaching authorizations.

Raman and Damiani are combinable in that they both involve the art of identifying sections of a markup language document with identifications which enable the access to control the document. Raman teaches manipulation of the objects within that scheme, and Damiani teaches users who are permitted to access the document within that scheme.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Raman and Damiani for the obvious and beneficial purpose of limiting access to view certain portions of a document to certain users.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is expressed in Damiani for purposes of security, permitting access rights based on that groups need-to-know. The example given in Damiani is with medical records where hospital administrators, nurses, and doctors have different rights to sections of patient medical records based

Art Unit: 2176

on their need for the information, yet keeping the remainder of the records confidential.

See, Damiani, pages 192-196, example 6.1.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Raman and Damiani to result in the limitations specified in claim 1.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael K. Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-5533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00-4:00 EST.

Art Unit: 2176

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB/mkb


Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100